CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1917. Vol. VII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The new Bishop of Hereford.

The appointment of Dean Henson to the Bishopric of Hereford will give sincere satisfaction to Churchmen who really believe in the ideal of a National Church. Dr. Henson's well known dialetical powers, and his unflinching use of them in worthy causes, afford confidence to Liberal Churchmen that their point of view will not lack adequate presentation in the Upper House of the Southern Convocation.

To-day we have eloquent bishops, saintly bishops, organizing bishops, and scholarly bishops, but what the Church needs most in the present crisis are statesmen bishops—bishops who will not simply administer their dioceses, but *lead* in the great work of national religious reconstruction. We believe that Dr. Henson, like his immediate predecessor Dr. Percival, will be found to be of this type.

As a true father in God, to rule the diocese of Hereford will necessarily be an important function in the new bishop's life, but we venture to hope that it will be united to a function even more noble and arduous. We look to the new Bishop of Hereford to lead in the great task of re-establishing the National Church on a really national basis as a necessary preliminary to the unification of English Christendom.

Dr. Henson's numerous published writings, especially his *Godly Union and Concord* (1902), and *Puritanism in England* (1912), indicate that there is no occupant of the episcopal bench better fitted than he to help the Church of England to retrace the fatal step which she took with the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662. Profound understanding of the

character and constitution of the Church of England; accurate knowledge of the true relationship of the National Church to the separated English communions which surround her; deep sympathy with those communions, and an earnest desire to unite them once again with us in the bonds of godly union and concord are essential to one who would lead in the great work of re-establishment; and yet there is one more quality not less needful, judicious and unflinching courage. We mark all these qualifications in the new Bishop of Hereford, and humbly hope that he is destined by Divine Providence to lead in the accomplishment of so difficult but glorious an undertaking.

A Second Savoy Conference.

A suggestion of considerable interest has been made by a well known Nonconformist divine, the Rev. H. Arnold Thomas, of Bristol, in a letter to the *Times* of December 5th, in which he proposes the summoning of a new Savoy Conference. His suggestion was followed next day by a sympathetic letter from the Rev. T. Dinsdale Young. The proposed Conference would be summoned by Parliament; it would be composed of representative men of all Churches; it would try to ascertain whether all Christian people in this land, or at least the great bulk of them, could not be included in the English Church of the future. The old Savoy Conference was summoned by Charles II., at the request of the Puritans, with the object of securing Prayer-book revision in order to comprehend if possible all religious parties in the National Church.

It is unnecessary to deal in detail with the demands of the Puritans and Presbyterians, led on that occasion by the saintly Richard Baxter. Comprehension was to be attained mainly by flexibility in Church services and organisation; for instance Baxter desired that "the Liturgy should not be too rigorously composed, nor the minister confined thereto." However, on the Puritan side there was little disposition to abate their demands, and on the Anglican side even less disposition to

make concessions. Hence the Conference proved an absolute failure from the point of view of comprehension, and the Act of Uniformity of 1662 which legalised its proposals, led to the permanent establishment of Nonconformity in England. The attempt at comprehension was renewed in 1689, when a Bill was brought in for "uniting His Majesty's Protestant subjects." The question was referred by Parliament to Convocation, which promptly killed it. Thus the project of Comprehension through Revision fell to the ground.

Has the Church of England learnt anything in the course of the last 200 years? To judge by Convocation's efforts at Prayer-book revision during the last ten years, we feel bound to reply: "Officially, very little; unoffically, a good deal." The lesson of past experience is that no proposals for comprehension by liturgical revision ought to be referred for sanction or approbation to an unreformed Convocation. Another lesson to be derived from more recent experience is, that the members of the proposed Conference had better be nominated by the Crown, and not by the so-called representative assemblies of the different denominations. In a few years' time, to judge by the rate at which things are moving, "the unsafe men," whose views and temperament are widely different from that of the majority who at present dominate the situation, will constitute the directing force in the different denominations.

These "unsafe men" are almost certain not to be elected as members of a Savoy Conference by the official representatives of their denominations, and yet their presence and policy alone promise a successful issue, for they anticipate the spirit of the future. Should Parliament nominate the Conference members it is possible that some of the "unsafe men" may be included. At present the Premier's hands are probably much too full for him to be able to give thought to Mr. Arnold Thomas' proposal, but if the Rev. Dr. Sir Robertson Nicholl favours it, much is possible.

In May, 1914, the *Modern Churchman* published a paper delivered by the Rev. Arnold Thomas to the Bristol Branch of the Churchmen's Union. It concludes with these words:—

> "I trust a happier era is before us, and that we shall be able in the coming years to join together as humble seekers after truth, and as common worshippers of that God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the love and service of Whom we are one, in spite of all the differences that divide us either in polity or in opinion."

If the new Savoy Conference could meet in that spirit of love and truth, anything is possible in the way of success.

Liberalism and the Foreign Mission Field.

A movement of no little significance is taking place within the greatest of our Anglican Missionary agencies, the Church Missionary Society. A number of the younger men are saying like the sons of the prophets to Elisha, "Behold now, the place where we dwell is too strait for us," and they have been joined in their protest by a number of the older men, including the Bishops of Chelmsford, St. Albans, Peterborough, Sodor and Man, Barrow-in-Furness, and Bishop Gwynne. As a consequence the following Memorial, with an important list of signatures attached, has been presented to the General Committee of the Society.

> "We desire with much respect to lay before the General Committee a Memorial concerning the present position of the Church Missionary Society.
>
> "We do so as men and women filled with great hopes for the extension of God's Kingdom, and convinced that at the present moment unparalleled opportunities offer a challenge to all who hold that the world's hope lies in Jesus Christ, and that in Him alone can its need be met.
>
> "We believe that the Church Missionary Society may be now even more than before, an instrument in the Church of Christ to this end. Both on account of its position in the Anglican Church, and of its relations with other communions, the Society has, we believe, a a special vocation with regard to questions of reunion. As a result of its enterprise and devotion in the past, together with its gathered experience, it possesses vast resources for the immediate evangelisation

of the world. We believe that Evangelical truth supremely matters, and that the Church Missionary Society stands for this alike at home and in the mission field.

"The gravity of the present position consists in this, that a large number of men and women who share these convictions, including in many cases those students at the Universities to whom we must look for personal service, feel that they cannot associate themselves with the work of the Society; and we believe that for the removal of misunderstanding, and for the fulfilment of the purpose for which the Society exists, it is essential that fresh recognition should be given to the following points:—

"(1) That the Society, recognising that among its members are people of very different intellectual outlook, and with very different modes of expressing the spiritual life, gladly accepts the services of all who are attracted by its tradition, and who, striving to interpret Evangelical truth in accordance with the Holy Spirit's guidance in each succeeding age, seek through its means to evangelise the world.

"(2) That in accordance with the spirit of its ancient tradition, the Society, while adhering firmly to its own principles, works in co-operation with other communions, and welcomes fellowship with societies representing other schools of thought within the Anglican Communion.

"(3) That in accordance with the spirit of its ancient tradition, the Society's position with regard to revelation and inspiration is defined for it simply by the formularies of the Church of England; and that no further restriction or definition of belief on these subjects is sought for from its candidates, agents, or supporters.

"One further consideration we desire to urge. In view of the need that all members of the Society should be brought into closer touch with each other, and should have fuller opportunities of service; in view also of the conditions and tendencies arising out of the war, it is of the utmost importance that the Society should advance further along the line of democratic control. We recognise that already much has been done, and we desire to urge that in the plans that are being formed provision shall be made for increasing the sense of responsibility (other than financial) among the Society's members, and for securing a constant supply of younger men and women upon its committees.

"In loyalty to principles the authority of which we accept in our own lives and in furtherance of the work of the Society which we love, we present this Memorial, earnestly desiring that in the future, more faithfully than in the past, we may together serve in the Church Missionary Society the cause of the Kingdom of God."

A sub-committee of twenty-one has been appointed to consider and enquire into the questions raised by the Memorial. Liberal Churchmen, although among the supporters of the

C.M.S., have been painfully aware (owing to the rejection of some of their friends by the Society) that the position of the C.M.S. is much narrower than that of the Church of England. That this should be so is natural enough in the light of its history. The formation of the C.M.S. was one of the most valuable results of the great Evangelical Movement, and consequently the Society was almost of necessity confined to the reception and sending forth of those who were in entire sympathy with the doctrines and practices of that Movement. The splendid work achieved by the Society during the last century is one of the glories of the English Church, but "new truth makes ancient good uncouth," and with the great changes which have taken place in the forms of English theology and devotion within recent years it was becoming evident to many that the C.M.S. must either widen its doors or else lose a large number of deeply religious but modern minded men and women from among its future servants. We hope for the sake of the Society, and above all for the sake of its great work in the foreign mission field, that it will grant the concessions desired by the Memorialists, and while retaining its evangelical piety, permit its policy to be permeated by the ideal of obedience to the Spirit rather than to the letter—a principle which is really altogether in harmony with Evangelical principles.

The divergence of views within the Society, as its Hon. Sec. the Rev. Cyril Bardsley points out, turns on that question which Liberals have persistently raised, but which members of all Church parties must eventually answer, "What are essentials, and what are non-essentials?" No missionary society can afford to bear about to-day a vast *impedimenta* of non-essentials, when even the essentials of the Christian Religion are subject to persistent scrutiny and attack.

The *English Churchman*, which represents a non-progressive Protestantism, regards the appointment of the sub-committee as the preliminary to a rupture. It predicts:—

"This solution only postpones the inevitable rupture which the Modernist and Sacerdotalist movement will inflict on the C.M.S."

We venture to disagree with this. Where there is reasonable concession and Christian consideration there need be no rupture.

Christian Social Re-construction.

The Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions, representing Anglicans, Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Quakers, and Unitarians, have recently put forward a statement of principles and proposals for the approbation of their constituent Social Unions. This they have been led to do by recognition of the unique part which Christianity must play in social re-construction, and in the hope, not only that this part will be recognised, but that the social conscience of the various denominations may be quickened, and their efforts co-ordinated. They confess that their scheme must needs lack precision, but they believe that it exhibits *guiding principles* and a *compelling motive*. The scheme is divided into three parts.

The first part sets forth the chief social rights, claims, and duties of men according to the Christian conception of life, and the Christian ideal of the family and State.

The second indicates, briefly, some of the modern social evils which are largely due to a neglect of Christian principles.

The third indicates various means by which our social conduct may be brought into closer conformity with the Christian standard.

The *rights* set forth are the right to life, employment, rest, and recreation, marriage and education. Under the right to life is included the living wage. Of course the real difficulty is that without a great increase in production there is not enough food, drink, clothing, house-room, &c., to go round on the scale demanded by many benevolent but ignorant and unpractical persons. Take the right to marriage, where

women exceed, by more than a million, the number of men in England, it is plain that, without resorting to polygamy, every English woman cannot exercise the right of marriage. The remedies suggested by the scheme do not touch the supreme difficulties in many cases. It is not enough to say: "Be good and you will be happy."

In dealing with duties, emphasis is laid on the duty of *moral self-control* and the *duty of working*, and of the training needful for their exercise.

The Christian ideal of the State avoids, so it it is affirmed, the two extremes of *laisser faire*, and the usurpation by the State of functions which naturally belong to the individual and the family; but no further attempt is made to define the functions of the Government beyond saying that public action or organisation is not a substitute for private action, but supplements and completes it. Moreover, the healthy State expresses and gives form to the willing co-operation of the community. This means that the Christian State must be democratic; but it does not get over the difficulty of deciding, as Christians, which functions are lawful and which are unlawful for the Government. We know how extremely limited the functions of government were in the eyes of the Manchester School—"the protection of life and property, and the maintenance of the equal liberty of all," with the concession that possibly the State might rightly undertake the functions of the Post Office and National Education; on the other hand, we know how extremely extensive are the modern collectivists' conception of the proper functions of government. This scheme, however, gives little help in deciding what are the functions which, as Christians, we must regard as rightly conceded to the State, and which as wrongly taken from the individual. The over-ruling principle must be, we imagine, "the greatest good of the greatest number," and then we have to decide the tremendous question as to what constitutes the *summum bonum*. As Christians our answer is clear—the

summum bonum is eternal life, here and hereafter. A Christian State must be so organised as to offer to all its citizens the opportunity of sharing in eternal life. In that case, the supreme function of a Christian State is to teach the Christian religion, and to provide a sphere for the exercise of its principles and the realisation of its ideals. Yet we imagine that all, except some few of the Anglican and Presbyterian representatives of the Interdenominational Social Conference, would dissent from this conclusion.

On the whole we believe it better for the Churches not to draw up and sign and publish and advocate a general scheme of Social Rights and Remedies, but to co-operate to reform definite abuses in a positive and practical fashion, *e.g.*, such an abuse as bad housing, and this in each locality. We should desire to see created in every township in England a Social Welfare Society, consisting of the members of every Christian denomination, who would strive to promote the social welfare and happiness of their own community. These local societies could, no doubt, be co-ordinated and even possess a headquarters in London; but, frankly, we believe in local government and local enterprise and initiative, and dread centralisation and its bureaucratic methods.

We commend this interesting document[1] on Christian Social Re-construction to our readers' attention, not because of what it achieves, but because of what it attempts, and because it is significant of the sense of social responsibility which is growing rapidly in the Church.

We ought to add that the document possesses an admirable preface, contributed by the Bishop of Oxford, who confesses, we are glad to note, that:—

> "In the history of the Church . . . the emphasis on orthodoxy by comparison with self-sacrifice, and especially the service of the brethren, has been unbalanced and exaggerated."

[1] Copies of the document can be obtained from Miss Lucy Gardner, 92, St. George's Square, London, S.W.1. Price 1d. each, or 6/6 a hundred.

The Church and the New Age.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is a growing, active, business-like communion, whose bishops, we are credibly informed, do not wear gaiters, and have no objection to being addressed as "Bish." Its policy on the whole has been one of reasonable but not rapid adjustment to environment.

The following extract from the Bishop of Newark's address to his Diocesan Convention indicates, however, that the Bishop feels that considerable more adjustment is needed if the Church is to prove efficient in the new age on which we have already entered :--

> "The Church will have no place in the regard of the American people unless it can part company with small controversies and put the emphasis upon the great duties of the time. The Church is to be tested to learn whether it can be efficient in a new age, when the world's very life is in question. The old world is gone, the summer of 1914 is very far away from us. We are living in a new time in which men are thinking in new ways, and the Church must show its ability to direct their thoughts and conduct.
>
> "My impression is that greater changes than any of us are disposed to think of are coming. I believe, for example, that the old systems of training the Clergy in our Divinity Schools must pass, and that they ought to go, that the Clergy may live and work in their own age, leaders of a new generation, makers of a new world. The expert theologian with his fine distinctions and his speculations concerning things which nobody ever understood nor ever shall understand, ought to give place to good leadership with appreciation of the needs of the new time. The ecclesiastic ought to give place to the teacher and prophet, declaring the eternal truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and their application to men doing the world's work to-day. The long accepted methods of preparing men for the ministry are largely discredited, and the appeal to well trained and right-minded men to accept the limitations of such courses has lost its power. They who are using the Holy Scriptures for the defence of doctrines by proof-texts, and studying St. Paul's Epistles in a meticulous way which he never dreamed of, have no message for this generation. They may reproach the world for the way it is going and criticize those who are trying to make a new world wherein dwelleth righteousness, but there is scant hearing for them.
>
> "They who are afraid of changes, who wish to keep everything as it has been, forgetful that God is saying to every generation, 'Behold, I make all things new,' are sure to be uncomfortable. I do not expect to live to see the adjustment made, but I think that the Church must

accept it or lose its place of influence, and I have unwavering faith that power and strength lie in transferring the emphasis from things ecclesiastical to the presentation of the great principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. If some of us are too old or too timid to march, we must not get in the way of those who have a vision and who are living and working for the future.

"In our Churches there must be new services, prayers, and intercessions which give expression to the new hopes and aspirations of people, which meet the needs of people who are in perplexity as to what their duty is, who are bearing burdens and anxieties such as have not come to this generation before, who need comfort and help in the hard experiences of life. Many customs, many traditions, must yield to new requirements. Rubrics must be interpreted generously. There is more hope in love and life than in strict discipline. The Church ought to take a new place in the service of the community and commend itself to the confidence and love of the American people. The old prejudice, never quite outlived, against this Church because of English origin, may pass, for a generation which finds the United States and Great Britain in alliance. Unless the Church is awake to its opportunity the Clergy will find themselves displaced by unordained religious teachers and workers of voluntary societies, and the people will look to other agencies than the Parish Churches for religious instruction and inspiration. We must be larger minded than ever before, and accept unusual ways of doing the Lord's work. This is not to break from the old Church with its continuous life from the beginning, its marvellous history of service, and its devotional treasures. It is rather to let it live a larger life."

To impart and to enjoy "larger life;" that is the Church's Mission. "I came," said Jesus, "that they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly."

The Religion of the Public School.

For some years past leading members of the Anglo-Catholic party have felt dissatisfied with the religious training given in the greater public schools. The Bishop of London, who claims to have preached in the chapel of every public school in England, has recently joined in the attack on public school religion. This is criticized in this month's *Journal of Education*, in an article entitled "Orthodoxy in our Public Schools."

The Bishop's critic seems to think that the Bishop judges of religious education not by its character-forming value, but by

some ecclesiastical standard of his own. Has a boy enthusiasm for the Church of England? Does he make a reverent use of its ordinances? Does he know the radical difference between the creeds of Churchmen and Dissenters? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, the religious education would appear to be good, otherwise it is not. Unfortunately experience shows that it is possible for boys to have received this kind of religious education, and yet for their general character to be quite unsatisfactory. Such boys might be selfish, lazy, bad-tempered, unsportsmanlike, untruthful. It was a great headmaster, Dr. Arnold, who remarked that many who were exceedingly precise in ecclesiastical matters fell below the level of men of the world in courtesy, charity, temper, and truthfulness.[1]

The question for the Bishop to ask is this: How do the characters of boys who have been brought up in ecclesiastical schools of unimpeachable Catholicity compare with those turned out by the public schools generally? It is easy and dangerous to generalise, but we doubt whether the ecclesiastical ideal of education for boys is such a success as the Bishop seems to believe. Early Confirmation, the regular practice of Confession, the constant participation in the Holy Communion, may assist some boys to develop on right lines morally, spiritually, and mentally, but such things may act as a provocative to hypocrisy and formalism, and even to atheism in the case of others, for as Francis Bacon has observed:—

> "The great atheists . . . are ever handling holy things, but without feeling, so as they must needs be cauterized in the end."

The *Challenge* of November 30th, in commenting on a recent sermon on Public School Religion by the Bishop of Oxford, remarks very wisely:—

> "There are those who speak as if without any change in the general intellectual temper of the country a public school could be turned into a private branch of the primitive Apostolic Church. Of course, the thing is absurd. The boys come from homes in which the temper is that of

[1] *Life of Arnold*, p. 281.

educated Englishmen generally. The masters are themselves old public school boys who have been drawn from the same class, and subjected to the same influences. The problem of religion at the public school cannot be solved by any sort of dodge; neither the abolition of compulsory chapel nor the institution of a weekly choral Eucharist is going to make any material difference. The problem of religion at the public school is the problem of religion in England" (p. 70).

Dr. Gore in the sermon referred to in the *Challenge*, pointed out the danger that comes from teaching religion in conjunction with old-world and worn out views of history. This danger, we believe, is being steadily eliminated in the greater public schools by the use of modern Old Testament text-books. Probably no public school dares provide modern New Testament teaching, but in this the Public Schools are not behind most of the Theological Colleges.

The Retention of a Sham.

It would be well if all English clergymen could command sufficient knowledge of Greek to be able to get more from the reading of their New Testament in Greek than they can get from reading it in English.

The study of the Greek Testament is one of our great legacies from the Revival of Learning. Before the sixteenth century the clergy of the Western Church read their New Testament (if they did read it) in the Latin tongue, and interpreted, or misinterpreted, the scriptures in accordance with the limitations or inaccuracies of the Vulgate. To-day, however, there is a tendency, owing to various practical considerations, to abandon the compulsory study of Greek for Ordinands, and to demand instead, a knowledge of more immediately useful and necessary subjects. We regret this deeply, but recognise the need for it as a practical expedient. In the face of it, we feel like a General abandoning some of the smiling plains and ancient and picturesque towns of his native land in order that he may be in a better position

to defend what remains. The old ideal that the English clergyman should be a scholar and a gentleman, seems to be shorn of half its reality when he becomes a Greekless man.

It is proposed, however, by some of our Church authorities, to retain compulsory Latin. The reason for this is that the Preface to the Ordinal (written in 1552) requires that the ordinand shall be "learned in the Latin tongue," and Canon 34 (agreed upon in the year 1603) requires that, if the ordinand be not a university graduate, he shall "at the least . . . be able to yield an account of his faith in Latin." It is difficult to imagine a better example of straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel than the proposal to abandon Greek but to retain Latin for the reason assigned.

In Tudor times a knowledge of Latin was needful for any member of the professional classes, and, not least, for clergymen. In those days the most important theological treatises were written in Latin, and nearly all English religious writings abounded in Latin quotations. Even the parish registers were kept in Latin. No correspondence could be carried on with learned men or foreign ecclesiastics except in Latin. It was the *lingua franca* of educated Europe. To-day, Latin is of very little practical use to a clergyman. If an ordinand is required to learn another tongue besides his own, Hellenistic Greek will be much more useful to him than Latin. Without Greek he can understand practically nothing of New Testament textual criticism; without Greek he cannot enter into the finer shades of meaning of many important passages in the New Testament. The regular use of Trench's *Synonyms*—a treasury of New Testament exegesis—is impossible unless he knows something of Greek. The knowledge of Latin, though still of some professional use to the lawyer and doctor, provides nothing which, in the case of the clergyman, is at all equal in value to the knowledge of Greek. It seems to us, therefore, most injudicious of our church authorities, in the case of ordinands, to retain Latin and to dispense with Greek.

Canon Cruickshank, Professor of Classical Literature in Durham University, has recently put forward a strong case in favour of substituting Greek for Latin as the classical language to be learnt by ordinands, and suggests that it should be compulsory in priests' as well as in deacons' examinations.[1]

But the reason assigned by those who wish to retain Latin, seems even more objectionable than the action itself. To retain Latin because it was required more than 300 years ago is an absurd reason, seeing that in the interval Latin has largely lost its professional usefulness. To retain Latin because it is required in the Preface to the Ordinal and in the Canon is most inconsistent, for many of the Canons and Rubrics are dead letters to-day. No bishop would dream of insisting on their all being observed, and no bishop observes them all himself. Moreover, to retain Latin is a most wasteful proceeding, because much better value can be obtained by giving the same amount of time to Greek. But, worst of all, the retention of compulsory Latin is, in most cases, the veriest sham. The majority of those who are ordained are not "learned in the Latin tongue," and they cannot "yield an account of their faith in Latin." The bishops who ordain them know this; the archdeacons who present them know this; the bishops' chaplains who examine them know this; the officers of the theological colleges who teach them know this. Why, then, retain compulsory Latin? Is it not far less demoralising openly to break the letter of a regulation, while we try to observe its spirit by ordaining well-educated ordinands, than to conspire to retain a sham?

The present writer has never known any ordinand who felt any real interest in, or enthusiasm for, the Latin paper set in the deacon's examination. If he were a classical scholar it seemed beneath contempt. If he were not a classical scholar, but had graduated in science or mathematics or modern languages, it seemed to him a useful, but irritating, incon-

[1] *The Future of Greek*, by A. H. Cruickshank. Pub. Blackwell. Price 1/- (1917).

venience. The paper served, perhaps, one useful purpose. It gave the ordinand an early introduction to the inexplicable and depressing methods of the Church authorities, and afforded a glimpse into that official ecclesiastical mind which, when our Lord encountered it, drew from Him His sternest rebuke and most cutting satire.

A Novel Proposal.

A sincere and useful book, *Chaplains in Council*,[1] with an introduction by General Sir Henry Horne, K.C.B., which no clergyman can read without asking himself serious questions, contains this statement in a paper dealing with "A Soldier's Religion," contributed by the Rev. A. H. Gray:—

> "Emotional religion frightens them because they are essentially shy and reserved, ritualistic religion is unmeaning to them, and theological religion is unintelligible."

The "they" are the majority of British citizens in *khaki*. But if *emotional*, *ritualistic*, and *theological* religion are eliminated, what religion remains? Presumably *moral* religion, and this will be found to appeal to the average man when the conduct and character of those who profess it, reflect their teaching. Emotional Evangelicalism and Ritualistic Catholicism have much to their credit in the history of the English Church during the last century and a half, but it is open to question whether they have succeeded in winning more than a minority of the nation, and have not done something to discredit religion in the eyes of a vast multitude who might have become convinced Christians if it had not been for the fact that so many of the clergy have either been exponents of the one type of religion or of the other, or, in recent years, of both combined. It has been predicted that this age will be the age of the moral forces—the age, not of the ascetic, or of the fanatic, or of the scholastic theologian, but of the essentially good and sane, the pleasant and kindly, the unselfish and sincere person. As we read the Synoptic Gospels it is possible

[1] Published by Edward Arnold, price 6d. (1917).

to perceive that the most important part of the religion of Christ was of this moral kind.

Might it not be well for the Christian Church to strive to-day to instil, or rather develop, this kind of religion, and allow revivalism, ritualism, dogmatism, and ecclesiasticism, to sink into insignificance, only to be revived later on when the religion of morality needs to be supplemented by other types of religion which are less exacting, but also less Christian. The Christian Church has not got the *emphasis* where Christ placed it. She places emphasis on what costs less, and had, apparently, no value for Christ.

The fundamental aim of our religion should be as this little book indicates, not personal salvation or saving one's own soul, but serving Christ, and as the writer points out:—

> "That means being a certain kind of employer or employee. It means doing business on certain unselfish and upright principles. It means a certain kind of home life. It means being a certain kind of husband, father, brother, and so on. It involves a certain exacting attitude to the poor and all sufferers. It means staying in the world, and there proving yourself a good friend—a sociable, charitable person."

The Genius of the English Church.

The first volume of the Modern Churchman's Library has appeared in the form of *The Genius of the English Church*[1] by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes. We do not propose to review it in this number of the *Modern Churchman*, but merely to draw attention to it, and commend it. Readers of our magazine owe much to Mr. Fawkes' brilliant pen, and we feel that they will regard their debt as very considerably augmented when they have read his latest volume. To-day, when some of our fellow Churchmen are demanding Disestablishment as the sovereign remedy for the Church's present distemper, and others are prescribing less drastic treatment, we would venture to suggest

[1] John Murray. 2/6 Cloth; 1/6 Paper Covers.

that all who presume to prescribe remedies should first make careful study of the patient's constitution and life habits. has been sarcastically alleged that physicians "put medicin of which they know little into bodies of which they know less Church reformers whose zeal outweighs their experience ma be guilty of similar malpractices. Mr. Fawkes' book will assi its readers to a right judgment in regard to the English Churc She has a genius of her own as distinctive, as subtle, a tenacious as that of the English nation, and it is a genius whic is alien to the processes of Romanization and Denominationa ization. She is a National Church, and is equally remove from the imperialist absolutism of Rome on the one hand, an from the individualism of sectarianism on the other. Rom has her attraction for some Englishmen; sectarianism f others; but the great bulk of the nation, if they are to b Christians at all, will only be so by coming under the influenc of their National Church, provided she can appeal to all that deepest and best in them. How to help her to make th appeal efficiently is the problem which confronts all loy Churchmen to-day. Mr. Fawkes' book, whilst it informs an delights the reader, will also deepen his sense of love and loyal to the Church of England. He will forgive her many anomali when he understands her spirit.

In commending this volume to *all* our readers, we wou remind them that this is the first of a series, the publication which must of necessity depend upon the number of copi sold by an early date. The series will be varied to su different classes of readers. This volume will appeal especial to educated readers who, without being burdened with h torical *minutiae*, wish to understand the real significance English Church history. Its perusal by such might usefu be combined with that of Professor Watson's little volum *The Church of England*, in the Home University Library.[2]

[2] Williams & Norgate, price 1/3.

THE CHURCH AND MARRIAGE LAW REFORM.

By the Rev. J. B. Rowsell, M.A., Portsmouth.

There have been too few divorces in this country up to the present to disturb the Church of England from a somewhat anomalous position. A divorced person, as the law stands, may marry again while their former partner is yet living, and this marriage may be solemnised in their Parish Church, if a licensed minister in the Diocese can be found who will perform the ceremony. It has been held by many that the innocent party to a divorce suit should not on re-marriage be debarred from Church privileges, but what the Church has decided on this point is a matter of grave dispute. In view, however, of the proposed extension of the grounds and facilities for divorce, and, in consequence, the certain increase of divorces, it will be necessary to have some definite regulation of Church practice. At present, to judge by semi-official utterances, the Church of England seems inclined to follow the theory, if not the practice, of the Church of Rome in this matter, and refuse to recognise divorce for its members on any ground; but that this is not in accordance with the practice of the Orthodox Church, or the Protestant Churches in other European countries, need hardly be mentioned here. Such an attitude by the Church of England, provided the clergy have the loyal support of the laity, would doubtless do much to maintain a high standard of Marriage in this country; while the action of the Church would not necessarily cut off divorced persons from all Christian privileges, seeing that it is unlikely that every Christian body in the country would adopt an equally rigorous attitude, although of course it would exclude such persons from communion in the Church of England.

But is the Church, granted that its own attitude for its members is fixed, pledged to oppose and obstruct the State in legalising unions which from its own standpoint cannot be recognised? We are not now concerned with the defence of such an extreme proposal as that three or five years' continuous separation for any cause should be ground for obtaining a divorce, indeed later on we join issue with it; but what is our concern is that the opinion of Churchmen and Churchwomen who do not under present conditions disapprove of divorce as a civil measure, should find some expression. Otherwise the content of the resolutions and memorials on this subject, which are passed and forwarded for publication from certain sections of the Church, will appear to be the voice of the Church as a whole. One cannot feel, as these memorials often imply, that Churchmen really desire all their fellow citizens to be *coerced* into conformity with the standard of marriage they believe to be the highest and best for themselves: nor that in view of the disagreement among Christian teachers on the question of the indissolubility of marriage, they expect the legislature to abide strictly within the bounds of Church law and practice.

In the belief that the Church ought to have some contribution to make to any proposals for the alteration of a law, where questions of moral principle arise, we venture to submit the following considerations. We suggest that it is our first duty to protest against the present marriage law, and to demand its amendment. Even if we hold divorce to be a measure of expediency rather than of principle, why should injustice, class privilege, and harsh restrictions, which would be vehemently opposed elsewhere, be tolerable in a measure of expediency? The present law is unjust, in that it permits a double standard of morality for man and woman; it is partial, in that the poorer and working classes have no facilities to obtain relief in the Divorce Court; it is ineffective, because its sole relief in many cases of wrecked homes is separation without permission to re-marry, whereby it raises many grave moral problems and

solves none. Unqualified opposition to reform is calculated to keep this law with all the grave objections that may be raised to its present working, unaltered; and it is surely the duty of those who contest the proposals now before the country, at least to express disapproval of the law as it stands, and to make some suggestions for its amendment.

If divorces are obtainable at all in this country, it is but just that a woman should obtain relief on the same grounds as a man, and that the poor should have the same facilities for petitioning as the rich. Thus far both Reports of the Royal Commission on Divorce are in agreement. As to whether any extension whatsoever of the existing grounds for divorce or disannulment of marriage would be detrimental to the sanctity of marriage, and lower the standard of sexual morality in this country, is a question of great complexity. We conceive, however, that the hardships of the present law are so great in certain cases that the sanctity of marriage would be increased, and certainly the temptation to immorality reduced, by the alteration of that law. At any rate it is in the name of morality, not of laxity, that many are sincerely agitating for these extensions.

Next to the demand for an equal and impartial law for both sexes, and all classes, we must refer to the practice of granting permanent separations without permission to re-marry. The law that enforces a condition of celibacy is what no law should be, to quote the Majority Report of the Royal Commission, so harsh as to lead to its common disregard. The unions that are formed in the face of this condition of separation, and the families that are the fruit of them, are a serious menace to the moral tone of the community.

While further opportunities for divorce may not bring these unions up to the level of Christian marriage, they will, at any rate, establish the security of many homes, and the legitimacy of many children who would otherwise bear the stigma of bastardy.

On the question of what further extension there should be of the grounds for obtaining divorce, we feel compelled to join issue with the proposals now prominent. That a drastic change should be made in the law, before there has been opportunity to judge the effect in operation, of any of the unanimous recommendations of the Royal Commission is in itself a powerful objection: but further than this, we suggest that where separations are by mutual consent only, however long a period of time they may cover, they are insufficient grounds for divorce; where however they are due to wilful desertion, or are granted by any Court, it is quite another matter. There is a vast distinction between the State regarding marriage as a contract terminable at will, after a certain period of separation, as the proposals referred to seem to imply that it should, and regarding marriage as normally a life-long union but rendered dissoluble by certain overt acts: whether these acts, that form grounds for a divorce, should include all those recommended by the Majority Report of the Royal Commissioners can hardly be discussed here, but the history of civilization admits of no question that the latter view of marriage should be the guiding principle in legislation, nor does either Report of the Royal Commission suggest variance with it.

The legalisation of the subsequent marriage of the respondent and co-respondent to a suit constitutes, to some minds, the gravest of all objections to divorce. So great an authority as Mr. Justice Bargrave Deane, in his evidence before the Royal Commission, pronounced against legal recognition being given to such unions on moral grounds. It does seem that here is a case where the law could reasonably make the way of transgressors hard, and disallow the marriage; its prohibition would act as a strong deterrent to that form of matrimonial offence which we all recognise as adultery. The Marriage law of this country would certainly bear a far higher moral tone if it maintained what was, we believe, an old provision in it, by

which a guilty union, that had inflicted grave and needless suffering on, perhaps, several lives, and had certainly caused the disruption of a home, could not at any time attain the dignity of marriage in the eyes of the State.

We suggest, finally, that no divorce should be granted without due consideration for the future of the children of the marriage, nor until the Court is satisfied that ample provision has been made for their education and welfare, according to the social position of the parents. It has been a crying shame in the past that a man has been able to leave his wife and children, under an order to contribute about a third of his week's income for their maintenance, and spend the residue on himself alone. The inadequacy of grants for maintenance ordered by magistrates has been in no small way responsible for a woman leading an immoral life, or acquiescing in an irregular union. We urge that homes and families, where both parents cannot or will not do their duty by them, must become the care of the State in a far greater degree than at present.

There were certain extensions of the grounds on which a marriage might be declared null, recommended unanimously by the Royal Commission. One of great importance is that of either party having venereal disease in a communicable form, and concealing it at the time of the wedding. This should certainly be ground for a sentence of nullity. This should also be the case if either party is subject to epilepsy or recurrent insanity. These are grounds which it is urgent that the law should recognise, in consideration of the health of the future generation, and no opposition to divorce generally ought to obstruct their enactment.

It is reckoned that there are at present a million persons in this country living separated, and prohibited by the present law from contracting fresh unions; this is alone sufficient proof of the need for Marriage Law Reform, yet, at the same time, it does not justify the adoption of hasty and extreme

measures, or legislation without due regard to certain moral and social principles. Many of these persons have probably ample grounds for a divorce, if they are given facilities, and if the ground of wilful desertion is recognised in a petition here, as in Scotland; others would not apply for relief even if they had the grounds and facilities. That a measure should be passed to deal with these cases alone is, we submit, an ill-advised proposal; at the same time legislation to avert an increase of them is, we claim, an urgent necessity. That such legislation should be carried out on a sound moral basis, is the concern of the Church, as much as it is the concern of those earnest social workers in and out of Parliament, who are giving themselves to its consideration at present. It seems to us that those Churchmen who are not satisfied with what goes forth to the public, in frequent resolutions and memorials, as to the Church's attitude to Marriage Law Reform, might be willing, through the *Modern Churchman*, to prepare and publish a memorial expressing their views. This can be arranged best by those interested giving their opinions:—

(1) On what ought to be the attitude of the Church of England to Divorce?—(*a*) in the case of her own members; (*b*) in the interests of the national welfare.

(2) On the question as to whether the State might not properly legalise unions in the interests of morality, which the Church should not be compelled to solemnise, inasmuch as they conflict with Christ's ideal of marriage.

(3) On the grounds for Divorce or Disannulment, whether they ought to be extended further than the Minority Report of the Royal Commission on Divorce recommends?

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL UNREST.

By the Editor.

Both Mr. Walter Runciman, M.P., and Mr. G. N. Barnes, M.P., have recently addressed Christian assemblies on the need for the Christian communions in this country taking a more active part in social reform, if not in actual collectivist propaganda. Mr. Runciman said:—

> "If the Churches stood for anything, they ought to be the main upholders of the rights of the helpless. If there was a conflict between the manhood of the poor and the property of the rich, the Churches ought to be on the side of the poor."

Mr. Barnes was reported as saying that there are two things in which the Church ought to help.

> "The first was education, and the second was the extension of collectivist activity in all phases of the national life. He thought the Church ought more and more to identify itself with the aspiration of Labour to equality of citizenship."

We agree heartily with the view that the Church has a pressing duty in regard to social betterment, the problem of poverty, the improvement of national education, although we do not think that phrases like "the manhood of the poor," and "equality of citizenship" do much to make the exact nature of that duty clearer. Mr. Runciman's suggestion that the poor are the helpless is somewhat out of date, and Mr. Barnes' plea that the Church should assist the cause of education seems perhaps a little hard on a body which has for centuries been the chief educator of the nation, and has done much more in that way than the State has yet accomplished. If Englishmen are civilised to-day in a way that Germans are not, it is due in no small degree to the efforts of the English Church to provide for all Englishmen the soundest kind of education, namely education in morals and religion.

As for interest in social questions, the English clergy, owing to the work of the Christian Social Union, the University, College, and Public School, Settlements, and many other causes, are probably more awake to the needs of the under-housed, under-fed, and under-educated populations in our large cities than members of any other professional class. At the same time it ought to be frankly recognised that a clergyman may be a keen worker for social betterment, and an ardent advocate of social reform, and yet decline to support the demands of the Labour Unions, and the extension of Collectivism. If the clergy are too often silent, as some of our socialist politicians think, it is not from indifference, but because they realise the great complexity of the problems involved. They do not believe that Utopia is to be realised simply by the passing of measures through Parliament or without the expenditure of much more moral effort both in the form of restraint and self-sacrifice than many of their countrymen seem disposed to exhibit.

But having said this, we agree with the general proposition that the time has come for the clergy to speak more decisively, and adopt a much more definite attitude towards social, economic, and political questions than is customary at present. The plea that it is the duty of a clergyman to preach the Gospel and to leave politics alone, must be ignored where social and economic and political conditions prevent human beings from developing physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually, as human beings ought to do. We recognise to-day the great part that environment plays in the development of character, and that we have no right to teach a human being to pray: "O Lord make me what I ought to be in spite of my terrible surroundings," when it is in our power, acting through the State, to improve those surroundings, which, otherwise, will almost inevitably stunt and degrade the human being subjected to them. We know that many will reply that Labour disputes and Collectivist propaganda must be kept

distinct from social reform and the claims of education. The attitude of the clergy towards the former ought to be like that of our Lord, who rebuked the poor brother who demanded that our Lord should tell his rich brother to divide the inheritance with him, saying: "Man, who made me a ruler and a judge over you," or that of St. John the Baptist, who gave this advice to a class of men who have always been notoriously underpaid: "Be content with your wages." Our reply is that wages, though an economic question, is so closely bound up with social questions such as housing and education, and these again with moral questions, that separation of them is impossible if Christian teaching is really to concern itself in a practical manner with all sides of Christian life and conduct.

Of course the main work of the clergy is to develop the Christian character and to propagate the Christian spirit, and when the clergy have successfully accomplished this, the filth and vice of slum-land, and the greed and blindness of disputes between Labour and Capital, will automatically have disappeared. But the pastoral work of the Christian ministry should not be separated from its prophetic function, which is to enunciate moral and spiritual truth, not, however, after the speculative fashion of the philosopher, but with direct practical application to existing social, economic, and political conditions. There is a growing need for instructiou in these matters. Press and Platform do their part, but they cannot take the place of the Pulpit. The preacher ought to be able to treat these questions more deeply and more independently than either the pressman or the politician. The pressman is subject to financial considerations; the politician dreads losing votes and personal prestige; but the clergyman, by his training and position, ought to be independent, and the nation should, if it knew its business, be as concerned for the independence of its prophetic preachers as it is for the independence of its judges.

But what a clergyman needs if he is to treat these questions usefully is not only deep sympathy and strong moral feeling,

not only complete independence and a judicious mind, but also a wide and accurate knowledge. Now there is no reason why at least a certain number of the clergy should not possess this knowledge. The clergy in industrial centres have great opportunities due to personal observation and experience. Such knowledge, however, must be supplemented, or rather preceded and accompanied, by text-book studies of economics and social and industrial history. The prophets of Israel are classics for the preacher of social righteousness, but the conditions of the modern world demand that he should also study modern books. Moral feeling and absolute personal integrity are wasted unless they are united to sound up-to-date knowledge. We venture in this connection to name two small books which every clergyman—and might we add (?) every layman—ought to know.

The first is Professor Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*.[1] This is an exposition of the great principles of Jesus Christ and their bearing on modern social problems. There are many books dealing with this theme, but for spiritual insight, clearness and beauty of style, and persuasive exposition, Peabody's book stands unrivalled. The practical reader, however, feels as he lays it down that there is much more to be said. The book breathes the spirit of the fields and shores of Galilee, and seems somewhat remote to those who breathe the atmosphere and listen to the clang of the Tyne and the Clyde. The best book to help here is Alexander Ramsay's *Terms of Industrial Peace*.[2] Mr. Ramsay begins where Prof. Peabody leaves off, and what he writes is none the less Christian because he never mentions the name of Christ. The spirit of good-will, justice, and hope pervades his pages, combined with wide and accurate modern knowledge. He knows modern industry from both sides, and he tries to see the situation from the point of view of the employer and the employed, and the

[1] In Macmillan's Sixpenny reprints.
[2] F. N. Constable & Co. (1917), price 3/- net.

nation as a whole. He makes no claim to offer permanent solutions, but he indicates clearly what are the remedies for our present troubles, and the terrible danger into which we are rapidly drifting owing to a combination of ignorance and selfishness. He recognises what the loss of our industrial and economic position will mean for this country, and the inevitable loss of that position unless labour and capital can co-operate in harmony for their mutual interest and the good of the community. Like a certain colonial statesman, he recognises the greed and short-sightedness of the employer, and the short-sightedness and greed of the worker. He sees the vicious circles in which things are travelling. He is against the profiteer be he master or man, but it is not greed which he regards as our greatest danger. It is blindness. He marks it in our industrial methods. Where an American factory turns out per man £800 worth of goods, an English factory does not turn out £400. This is because the American constitutes his Board of Directors differently, organises his departments differently, and goes in much more for specialisation, standardisation, and production in bulk. He has more imagination, flexibility, and initiative than his English competitor, hence he can pay his men better wages, and minister to them in various beneficial ways. Mr. Ramsay marks on the other hand the detrimental influence of the Trades Union restrictions in England in their limitation of output. He observes also the irregular attendance of the worker, which involves great loss of time. He comments on the disloyalty of workers to agreements made by their representatives with the employers.

These matters are connected with morality, and this, after all, is an educational question. As Mr. Ramsay remarks:—

> "American productivity would never have reached its present stage but for the willing co-operation, energetic support, and general adaptation, of the great body of the workmen." (p. 58).

The lack of these qualities in sections of our workpeople is due, directly or indirectly, to:—

> "Inadequate education, bad housing conditions, insufficient opportunity for reasonable and necessary recreation, resulting in the formation of social habits which tend to lower the tone of the individual, the lack of cultivation of the civic spirit, and a general disinclination or inability for independent reasoning." (p. 47).

Here there is large scope for the Christian communions, and let it be admitted that many of them have made great efforts at least on the side of general education and decent recreation. How many of our Labour leaders first discovered their powers of speech at bible classes and denominational debating societies?

As for Collectivism, or the State as universal employer, Mr. Ramsay is not disposed to urge its general adoption. He writes:—

> "As a vision of idealism it is superb; as an economic possibility it will bear discussion; as an appeal to workmen, hard worked and badly housed, it is attractive; but as a practical solution it can only be satisfactorily adopted in a limited number of cases."

The more carefully this little book is studied, the more clear does it become, to the unprejudiced thinker, that what we need in our industrial and social life, is the permeation of it by the Spirit of Christ—the spirit of consideration for others.

Mr. Ramsay writes:—

> "We say, without hesitation, that if, without prejudice to their own particular causes, employer and worker, manager and trade union leader, in the sphere of their own town and district, animated by the spirit of altruism, inspired by the same zeal to render civic and national service, were to come together, and scheme and struggle for some holy cause in which their interests do not conflict, they would later find that spirit permeate their more immediate and business relations, and make easy the solution of their difficulties." (p. 133).

And yet with all this idealism and happy optimism there is combined much common sense. Mr. Ramsay believes in altruism, but he also believes in self-interest. He recognises that the prospect of profit is a most powerful incentive to energy, enthusiasm, and initiative in business development; hence the individual must have full scope for his energy and initiative, and the reasonable certainty of reaping an adequate reward for himself.

But although an optimist, Mr. Ramsay is a sane optimist. He carefully warns the nation against optimism grounded in loose thinking, incomplete information, and the refusal to face facts. The Church needs that warning also. And with that warning he combines another against class antagonisms, cut-throat selfishness, and arbitrary measures.

Co-operation and good-feeling, steady constructive action, and reasonable compromise between employer and employed can, he believes, accomplish almost anything in this favoured land, favoured in its natural resources, geographical position, and the character of its inhabitants.

> "Working together in a common cause there is nothing they cannot achieve in the direction of national affairs, in the extension of industrial enterprise, in the creation and effective distribution of material prosperity, in the removal of festering, vitiating, and demoralising sores from the body politic, in the establishment of a purer, more enlightened, and morally-elevated citizenship" (p. 131).
>
> "If we could give to the manhood of this land, rich and poor, employer and employed, a holy vision of the duty which they owe to each other and to their country, if we could fan into a flame that spark of altruism and sacrifice which the war has kindled in our midst, if we could perpetuate and carry into the common walks of life the present spirit of national unity and the desire to present to the world a common front, there are no problems, industrial or social, for which an equitable, just, and satisfactory solution could not be found" (p. 139).

Like the prophets of old, he closes on a note of solemn warning:—

> "Above all, let them recognise that now is the moment . . . The nation which is torn by internal discord; which refuses to exercise its full power to produce; which permits the clashing of economic interests which can so easily be adjusted; which blindly seeks on either side to dominate by power, irrespective of right and justice; which knowingly permits itself to drift into industrial chaos and social strife, with its soul hide-bound in selfishness and its moral sense blunted to all the attributes of communal goodness—that nation will irrevocably fail. It will have been the framer of its own destiny, and it will be worthy of its doom." (p. 141).

WHAT IS PROTESTANTISM?

By the Rev. F. G. Given-Wilson, M.A., Vicar of Dedham, Essex.

Just four hundred years ago, on the eve of All Saints' Day, 1517, Martin Luther published his ninety-five theses against the sale of Papal indulgences, and with that action Protestantism may be said to have definitely originated. Luther had predecessors in Wycliffe and Huss, but they were forerunners of Protestantism rather than Protestants.

The word itself did not come into use, as is well known, till after the second Diet of Spires, which met in February, 1529, and re-enacted the Diet of Worms, refused all toleration to the "sect" of the Zwinglians, and forbade all further reform till a regular council was summoned. The Lutheran princes, with the Elector of Saxony at their head, protested against the decree, and so earned the name of "Protestants." It may have had a humble origin—great movements very often do—and suffer from comparison with the grander name of "Catholic," but it stands for the principle of religious and political freedom, and there is none greater which can occupy the minds and govern the actions of men. Movements, like trees, are known by their fruits; and the late Father Tyrrell once, in scathing phrase, characterised Catholicism, as he had learned to know it, as "so grand a name for so mean a thing."

What, then, is Protestantism?

> "This one thing is certain; whatever history teaches, whatever it omits, whatever it exaggerates or extenuates, whatever it says or unsays, at least the Christianity of history is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this."

So wrote Newman in his *Development of Christian Doctrine* (p. 7); and the whole object of his brilliant thesis in defence of the Roman Catholic Church is to prove that Catholicism is the true embodiment of historical Christianity.

Within certain limits it is hardly possible to deny the argument from history of the apologist of Catholicism, but the vital question is this:—When and how did Christianity assume that form which is undistinguished from Catholicism as we know it?

As a matter of history we can say with confidence that the beginning of the third century of the Christian era saw the establishment of a regular and permanent class of ecclesiastical officials. Then for the first time we recognise everywhere throughout the Christian Church the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, and history records the development of the Church on its institutional side as the embodiment of Christian truth, and the divinely appointed channel of spiritual power and grace.

But how was the Church guided to this particular organisation, and how was it that the theory took shape that only through the Church and its sacraments was the power of God unto salvation manifested and imparted?

The fact is that the Church obeyed that law of development which is as true of corporations as of individuals. "Man lives first, and thinks afterwards." The Church of Apostolic and sub-Apostolic days was a very real and living thing. It began with belief in Jesus as the Messiah, and in the power and presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers, but with no fixed theory and system of doctrine and organisation. These were matters of growth, and gradually assumed shape and form to suit the needs of a living and expanding Church. The New Testament knows nothing of a monarchical episcopate. It was the need of some leading local authority and central governing body which gave rise to these supreme ecclesiastical officials. The Church was one and universal, as the Roman world was practically one and universal. Doctrine and organisation developed side by side; and thus it was that the Church came to present her theology to the world in an institutional form.

As a thoughtful writer, Richard Holt Hutton, has well expressed it:—

> "Romanism was a vast organisation almost before it was a distinct faith. Rome did not so much incarnate her dogmas in her ritual as distil her dogmas out of her ritual. . . . Her theology flashed upon her, as it were, as she beheld the ecclesiastical form and order which were growing up out of her own unconscious energy. . . . Wherever the drift of Christian practice seemed to point towards the development of the Church's influence, there was a hint which she followed up eagerly to its limits, as the directing finger of a divine hand. And then contemplating her own fresh conquests from a heathen world, under the inspiring consciousness of being set to guide the mightiest and holiest of the world's forces, she did not hesitate to affirm that God was in her institutions, that He was acting through her agency, that He was really placing His divine influences at her disposal, and that in contemplating the orderly system of ecclesiastical life which was rising under her creating hand, she beheld the divine disposition of His living power."[1]

There is no room for Protestantism in such a theory, and as a matter of history there is no evidence of it—up to a point. Newman is right—"The Christianity of history is not Protestantism." But history is not one ordered and continuous progress of smooth and regular development. Nature knows of many faults and breaks in the geological strata of the earth's crust. History, too, knows of revolutions, catastrophes, awakenings, discoveries. Such was the period of the Renaissance which led up inevitably to the Reformation. It was an age of discovery—the new world; of invention—the art of printing; of the emergence of a distinctly national spirit; of the birth of new ideas, intellectual as well as religious, due, in great part, to the revival of the study of the literature of Greece. The word "Catholic" was inevitably losing much of its old and true significance, and coming to mean not much more than Papal.

For a change was slowly taking place in the political sphere, momentous in its consequences but scarcely perceived at the time. The "Hundred years" war with France had fostered the growth of national feeling in England, and the old mediaeval idea of the unity of Christendom under its two heads of Pope and Emperor was passing away. Also the "Babylonish

[1] *Theological Essays—Romanism, Protestantism, and Anglicanism*, pp. 376, 377.

captivity" of the Pope at Avignon had made it clear that the head of the Church, whose French leanings were notorious, could not be relied upon to preserve that impartial arbitration between nations, which was supposed to lie in the decisions of the Papacy. The taunting epigram which became current in England, and was to be seen posted up in many places after the victory of Poictiers,—

> "Now is the Pope become French, and Jesus become English,
> Now will be seen who will do more, the Pope or Jesus,"

gave expression to the growing sense that foreign rule was incompatible with national life, and prepared the way for that conception of a "national" church, which was to provoke realisation in the still distant period of the Reformation.

The fact is the world had been born again, as the term Renaissance signifies. Here once more the aphorism holds good—"Man lives first, and thinks afterwards." Men were living again—living under the influence of new facts and new ideas, and they had to think out what these meant for them. The change from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican theory of the universe was a type and example of the revolution which was taking place in the minds and hearts of men. Protestantism was the result of thinking out the meaning of the newly discovered facts about life—the extension, as we might say, of the body of ascertained truth, with all its consequent implications. And the sturdy northern races were not satisfied with the old Catholic theory, and so they invented Protestantism. Studying St. Paul with clear and unprejudiced eye, Luther found that it is faith in Christ, and not the Church's system which saves. Man needs no mediating priest: there is but one mediator, Christ Jesus; and Christ is free of every heart that accepts Him in faith. And so the institutional and sacerdotal theory of the Church, as the divinely appointed and exclusive channel of spiritual grace and power, came toppling down.

And now if, as a matter of history, Christianity knows nothing of Protestantism up to the Reformation, it is idle to say that "the Christianity of history is not Protestantism" after the

Reformation. It may, and does, include Catholicism as well as Protestantism; but history is meaningless if you ignore Protestantism as a part of embodied Christianity. Protestantism is there, shaping and influencing nations and men; a very real and powerful embodiment of the Christian spirit. You may dislike it, disagree with it, disbelieve in it; but Protestantism has been the most powerful force in the history of religion for the last four centuries. To quote once more from Richard Holt Hutton:—

> "The Roman is an embodied faith, laboriously providing all kinds of visible means for bringing men into union with God, and variously skilful in adapting these means to their ends. . . . The Protestant faith is a protest not merely against the abuse of this machinery, but against the machinery itself. It was suited to the plastic, all-embodying genius of Rome. It is far less suited to the freer mental genius of the German races, whose strength is more dependent on inward conditions, and who have found their freshest springs of active energy almost entirely in the free life of meditation, in the lonely inspiration of poetry, in the force of personal affections. Religious Art and Rhetoric, indeed,—in which genius is directed to outward ends,—are mainly of Roman Catholic parentage. But religious Poetry and Philosophy, in which genius finds all its conditions within itself, are, on the other hand, mainly Protestant. And so, too, while casuistry is the child of Rome, the spiritual life of Conscience and of conscious affections has found its most genial climate in the character of the northern races."[2]

In so far as Protestantism was the child of the Renaissance, it stood for the right of free enquiry. Scholastic theology claimed the whole range of knowledge for its province, and all fresh access of knowledge had to be explained by and accommodated to the prescribed doctrines of the Church. The discoveries of science and the free play of speculation were not, could not be, judged on their merits, but had to pass the test as to whether or no they told against the interests and beliefs of the Church. The Church was the infallible guardian of the truth, and in consequence could hardly tolerate that "fearlessness of intellect which is the first condition of seeing truly." Truth, indeed, was not in question; it was fixed, immutable. Protestantism was the revolt against the tyranny which bound alike the minds

[2] ibid., pp. 395, 396.

and consciences of men; and the Reformation is only to be understood,—

> "after we have perceived the enormous mass of superstition, injustice, and wilful ignorance, by which the theological idea had become so incrusted as to be wholly incompetent to guide society."[3]

And so it has come to pass that the reconciliation of religious and scientific thought has been due to Protestantism and not to Catholicism. By reconciliation I do not mean that it has actually been accomplished, but that it has been honestly attempted in a number of cases. To quote again from this same writer:—

> "It is hardly possible to deny the service which Protestantism rendered in preventing the revolution from Catholicism to scientifiic modes of thought from being that violent, abrupt, and irreconcilable breach, which we now observe in France and Italy, when we remember that the cause of toleration was systematically defended in England by men who as systematically defended the cause of Christianity."[4]

Or, as Dr. Fairbairn has explained it:—

> "The historian sees that the Christian religion is a vaster thing than any Christian Church, or than all the Churches; he sees too that these Churches differ from age to age both in character and action. He perceives that Catholicism in the early Middle Ages helped to organise modern civilisation, but has been in later times possibly the most disintegrating of all our social forces. The countries which most suffer from revolution are the countries where its rule is or has been most absolute; the countries where it has least authority most represent order and progress."[5]

It is true that the spirit of Protestantism has favoured the multiplication of rival and disparate religious bodies; but, on the other hand, it is well to reflect that ecclesiastical unity is not the unmixed good that some imagine and maintain it to be.

> "The Reformation meant the rise of many Churches, and thus the gradual dissipation of the belief in any one institution alone in possession of life and salvation. In the conflict of the sects, Protestant with Catholic, and Protestant with Protestant, freedom had a chance to grow and spread."[6]

When intolerance and persecution are excused as lesser evils than the sin of schism and the danger of heresy, it is interesting to find that so convinced an exponent of high-Anglican teaching

---

[3] Morley—*Voltaire*, p. 24.
[4] ibid, p. 218.
[5] *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 45.
[6] McGiffert—*Martin Luther*, p. 384.

as Dr. Figgis, does not shrink from tracing political liberty to the right, claimed by religious bodies, to organise their own system of government and belief.

> "In the seventeenth century it was not the isolated individual but the religious body, the sect with its passionate assertion of its own right to be, which finally won toleration from the State. By himself, apart from religious discords, the individual would have secured no freedom. The orgy of State-autocracy which set in with the Renaissance and was developed by the Reformation, would have gone on unchecked, as, indeed, it did in those States like France or the German principalities in which uniformity in religion was enforced. It was the competing claims of religious bodies, and the inability of any single one to destroy the others, which finally secured liberty. The rights of man were their recognition of the sense of his duties towards God. Political liberty is the fruit of ecclesiastical animosities."[7]

Again, Protestantism broke through the belief that the access of the soul of man to God was conditioned by the mediation of a priesthood. It proclaimed the priesthood of every Christian believer, and took its stand on the evangelical truth, which lay at the very heart of our Lord's teaching, that all men are the children of God, and that it is His will that they should have direct personal communion with Him as revealed in Christ.

The principle of Catholicism is the "nourishing of the religious life by sacraments, which can be duly administered only by a sacerdotal order." The principle of Protestantism is the free access of the soul to God, and the nourishment of the religious life by direct personal communion with the Saviour. This is not necessarily to discount the value and efficacy of the sacraments as divinely appointed channels of grace; but it does lay stress on the spiritual character of their reception rather than on the material means of their communication. It is not the priest who validates, but faith which appropriates, the divine gifts through their consecrated and traditional forms.

> "Whatever church says and means 'priest,' is on the Catholic side of the great controversy of Christianity; whatever church says and means 'minister,' in that act proclaims itself Protestant. The one in effect declares its belief that Divine grace and help can descend upon human nature only by certain fixed channels, of which a supernaturally

[7] *Churches in the Modern State*, p. 101.

endowed class of men have the control; the other asserts that the intercourse between the Eternal and the human spirit is absolutely free, and that all its conditions are fulfilled in Infinite Love on the one hand, and on the other in the awful aspiration and the passionate desire of holiness. Neither can free itself from the necessity of defining the visible Church; but in one case it is simply the assembly of the faithful, united by common beliefs, hopes, purposes; in the other it is a mystic communion, inheriting authority from the past, wielding supernatural power by organized instruments, and standing permanently between the soul and God."[8]

This distinction has been briefly expressed by an American theologian as follows:—

"The distinction between Catholicism and Protestantism consists in the fact that in the first the relation of the individual to Christ is made to depend on the Church, whereas the second emphasises the direct relationship between Christ and each believer."[9]

All that I have here attempted is to suggest a few thoughts on the meaning of Protestantism. But that is not to say that Protestantism exhausts or includes the content of Christianity. The future of Christianity is neither with Protestantism nor with Catholicism. Each must learn something of the other. That the Catholic idea of the unity and universality of the Christian Church with its sacramental system and ministerial order, is able to include the Protestant idea of the right of free enquiry, and the unmediated communion of the human soul with its Creator, the comprehensive character of the Anglican Church has so far shown to be possible. And it is the fact that it is a State-Established Church which has tended most to preserve its comprehensive character.

And it is some such combination of Catholic and Protestant as we have in the Church of England, which contains within itself the promise of the future, as Professor Gwatkin foresaw when he wrote:—

"First came the Catholic systems, where man was made for the Church; then the Protestant, in which the Church was made for man; and now we are feeling after something that shall give a real value to the Church consistent with the supreme value of the individual."[10]

[8] Charles Beard—*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 135.
[9] Adams Brown—*The Essence of Christianity*, p. 180.
[10] *The Kingdom of God*, vol 1, p. 257.

THE DIVINE ASPECT OF HISTORY.*

In our time the specialist is in possession. He has come into his own, possibly into some things which are not his own. We not only listen to him; we also believe him. No doubt we listen to our prophets, preachers, and philosophers as well, but their words do not carry a like conviction. At best, it is possible they may be right.

Some measure of admiration then is due to a writer who is bold enough to invite us to a survey of things in general. Here are two volumes which deal not with a period or with an empire, but with history as a whole. Hermes, in Lucian's delightful dialogue, once led Charon to the crest of the mountains, in order to shew him from such eminence the course of human affairs in the world below. To such a climb and to such a wide survey does Mr. Mozley summon us in his book. He has made the ascent himself, not without labour, and not with hasty or uncertain steps. The spirit of enquiry possessed him already in his sixteenth year, and family influences helped him on his way, for John Henry Newman, F. W. Newman, and J. B. Mozley, Regius Professor, were his uncles. Cambridge welcomed him as an undergraduate in 1858, and now, after fifty-eight years, has given publication to his book. We have a glimpse of him, in the early stages of his task, spending a summer month at Bangor in 1866, "trying to solve the mystery of the universe." But the mystery, when the month was over, remained unsolved, so he proceeded to climb the hill of knowledge in more gradual fashion, and stage by stage, period by period, through a long lifetime, our author has pursued his way. The reader now may follow him and contemplate the course of history from the standpoint to which he has attained. And while on other points there may be questions to be asked, or even objections raised, it will be allowed by all who have traversed it that the way is pleasant travelling. There is an ease and leisure and amplitude of style about these volumes, which sometimes recalls the tone of correspondence between learned men in earlier ages. We do not find our pathway insecure, yet we are not perpetually requested to observe the solidity of its foundations. The way is never steep and never rough, and we are never pressed or hurried, and from time to time our guide, as it were, turns to us in familiar converse and, forgetting history, lets us know exactly what he thinks himself. What Mr. Mozley "cannot but think"—it is his constant phrase—may or may not have the concurrence of the specialists, but at any rate will be worth our hearing.

Along such a road, under such conduct, the reader thus gains the summit and contemplates *the Divine Aspect of History*. What will he find? What will he miss? What will he question in the author's survey? Historical, religious, and philosophical elements are all contained in the picture before him and, though the view is single, he may prefer to distinguish for better consideration these several elements.

* *The Divine Aspect of History*, by J. R. Mozley. In 2 volumes, 32/-. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1916.

History, according to our ancestors, could be divided into two compartments, sacred and profane. Mr. Mozley, like other men of modern mind, would doubtless refuse to recognise such a principle of division. Through all history, not alone through that of one race or of one institution, he would trace the tokens and influences of the higher power at work. Thus Persia and Egypt, as well as Judea, have their place in his survey. He discerns merit not only in saints and prophets, but even in Epicurus and Voltaire. So far is his standpoint marked by catholicity of interest; so far does his vision pass beyond many traditional demarcations. And yet it is clear that throughout our author has his preferences. He sees in history the things he is concerned to see. Not *quicquid agunt homines*, but rather humanity in its religious development is this book's real theme, and so far it is more limited in scope than its title seems to imply. Great men, said no less a historian than Lord Acton, are almost always bad men. Mr. Mozley might have told us in more detail how the great personalities, Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, fit into the ordered schemes of providence, and said rather less about Athanasius and Zerubbabel. Is there real progress in the passing of the ages, or is the change and variety superficial, while the essential factors remain unmodified? The former alternative is clearly the theory of this work, but the considerations adduced in support of it are predominantly religious, and religion is only one element, however important, in the many that make history. Perhaps the writer tends to select and observe rather than to interpret. When we come to the end and ask, What then is the outlook for western civilisation? the answer which the last chapter gives us is on the whole a reassuring one. It would have been greatly more convincing had the forces which are so largely determining our later history received fuller recognition in the survey upon which this answer rests. The economic factor in the modern world, the growth of democracy, the changed character of human ideals, civilisation and the lower races, are all subjects which must be considered by any writer who would assure us with authority that human history, in spite of its occasional intervals of decadence, still moves onwards to some glorious end.

If, however, it is the religious element in history, rather than history itself, as such, and for its own sake, that Mr. Mozley has continuously in mind, there is no question that within these limits he has much to offer for his reader's consideration. His starting point is the invention of writing in Babylon and Egypt. This marks off civilised man from his predecessors. With this discovery history begins. But Babylon aud Egypt interest Mr. Mozley less than Persia and India. In particular, we might have had fuller treatment of Egyptian religion. To Buddhism a whole chapter is devoted, and the estimate of its value is balanced and sympathetic. Zoroaster, we are told, was not so thorough-going a dualist as is commonly supposed. 'His feeling is truly monotheistic." Mr. Mozley gives much attention to his teacher and to Persian religion generally, including Mithraism and the Magi. Then we pass to China. Lao-tsze is held to be a profounder teacher than Confucius, a judgment in which we believe most authorities on the subject would agree. What we may regard as the first section of the book

closes with chapters on the religions of Greece and Rome. For Socrates, of whom Mr. Mozley believes that Plato gives us a reliable and historic picture, there is enthusiastic admiration. Yet the Greek spirit, with all its achievements, did not establish a sure foundation for human life. It steadied and clarified the intellect rather than satisfied the soul. Among Roman writers Virgil has the place of honour, but Mr. Mozley is not afraid to say good things about Cicero. Among the Stoics he seems to think that in recent years Marcus Aurelius has been, if anything, over-rated.

On the whole the reader who, without being a specialist, is generally interested in such subjects, will not be disposed to dissent from Mr. Mozley's valuation of these eminent teachers. Though authorities are not quoted so frequently as might perhaps have been expected, and though there is sometimes a sort of naïve independence in the writer's estimates, the book is clearly the outcome of wide and prolonged study, and the simplicity of its judgments never suggests superficiality. The ground covered by the first eight chapters is of a very wide area, and no doubt on each particular subject points might be found demanding fuller discussion. This risk is inherent in the scheme. It remains that the survey has its interest, and that the main contours and proportions appear, so far as we may judge, to have been discerned with sound judgment and clarity of vision.

To many readers the point of central interest will be the author's attitude towards Christianity. The preface indeed informs us that the positive affirmation of the book regards especially the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, and the last chapter speaks of the whole survey as an endeavour to show that the experiences of religion have culminated in Christianity. Yet it is a Christianity shorn of many of its traditional properties, and Mr. Mozley frankly informs the reader that he must reckon himself among the "unorthodox" (ii. 70). He is well aware that no man may rightly, in surrendering Old Testament miracles, leave those of the New Testament out of sight. Except the miracles of healing, which were not in reality miraculous, Mr. Mozley would retain none, not the Virgin birth, not the raising of Lazarus, not the physical Resurrection, not the feeding of the five thousand, not the resuscitation of Jairus' daughter. And with them goes the prenatal glory of the Christ. This, in Mr. Mozley's judgment, will practically stand or fall with miracles, though we are glad to see that he allows that the connection is not absolute or inevitable. Even the sinlessness of Jesus is not retained; "we must hold that" in his baptism "Jesus did intend to confess his own sinfulness."

Now it is probable that to many of his readers this will appear to be nothing less than the process which, in days when we were less reluctant to use German phrases, used to be described as "emptying out the baby with the bath." And yet, when all has been said or surrendered, it remains that our author finds the key to his problem in Christianity and in Jesus Christ. He believes, with marked conviction, that He, and none other, implanted in mankind the root of eternal life. He holds the belief in a spiritual resurrection to be of the highest value—a value which is increased rather

diminished by the abandonment of all assertion of a physical event. would still teach children to pray to Jesus, and to set their hopes on a after death with Him in heaven. Emphatically Jesus is the Christ and Christ is the ruler of men. He first received the divine spirit in its ess, and by virtue of this is greater than His fellow-men, though not ide all range of comparison with them.

It is an interesting position, assailable, no doubt, like all middle tions, from two sides, and directly challenging the validity of the old native, *aut deus aut homo non bonus*. Is it in such terms that the Church ie future is to reconstruct her creeds? To some it will appear that there ot sufficient material left out of which to fashion anew the fabric of a . "The author's convictions," they will say, "are incompatible with criticisms." The reader on this point must form his own judgment. He ardly likely to accept Mr. Mozley's unconventional Christianity in all its ils. But he will be singularly unappreciative if he fails to recognise the e of so honest an attempt to face clearly the changes deemed inevitable, yet, withal, to retain unimpaired the true treasures of our spiritual tage.

So much in general terms. There is one comment more in detail which would make, before passing from this element in Mr. Mozley's book.

It is affirmed with insistence that in Jesus Christ there was a new arture. Something He had which the prophets only sought. Something implanted—it is Mr. Mozley's term—which did not grow in human soil re. Let us hear his emphatic statement.

"With the death of Jesus our earthly life for the first time struck root in the fields of eternity" (ii. 127).

It is possible that, in his anxiety to retain the spiritual and distinctive ient in Christianity, Mr. Mozley has somewhat over emphasised the rast between stage and stage in human progress. Certainly it is not e clear what is meant by the implied assertion that, till the Lord lived earth, man's life had not "struck root in the fields of eternity." Mr. ley does give a further explanation of the phrase, but it is not in our ment entirely convincing. Certainly his adverse critics will say that, all the surrenders that have been made, the grounds for asserting a departure in Jesus are no longer valid or sufficient.

Now after all, each new departure is a matter of degree. In every rrence there is something that is new, and something that is old. ning happens without continuity, and yet there would be no happening ntinuity were all. In the life and work of Jesus either standpoint may aken. It may be placed in line with its antecedents or it may be preted in terms of its distinctive and peculiar qualities. Under modern itions, more especially for all whose religious thinking runs on such as those of Mr. Mozley's book, there is wisdom in adhering to the nuity. That is the standpoint of the significant words with which the *le to the Hebrews* opens. That is the doctrine of the great Alexandrines. after all is the implication of even such a title as *Christus Consummator*. Mozley's whole book is one long testimony to the continuity of the

religious history of mankind. Perhaps a sub-conscious devotion to old ways of thinking has led him to over-accentuate the difference between tw stages in the process. It is better to see them in relation. Breaks and jer are not in nature's way nor yet in God's. After all St. John knew that t Word "was in the world" before He came to His own as the son of Mary

The book is religious rather than philosophic, but at times it deals wi ultimate problems from the philosopher's standpoint. Though the concre actualities interest its author more than abstract principles, we have at a rate a chapter on "The universe in relation to man."

Mr. Mozley makes the bold suggestion that no term need be set to t existence of man on this planet:—

> "The development of man, then, in the future ages is not necessari for a finite number of years only, after which it must cease." (i. 14).

Thus the extinction of the sun's light and heat within twenty milli years, as predicted by Helmholtz, need no longer darken our outlook. may be that, from some infinite and perennial source, new recuperati energy will for ever flow into our world, while the organising power of m may even be a force co-operative in securing to the earth "an eter development." The whole significance of history is heightened by th possibility, and its "divine aspect" in the author's scheme would be far le clear but for this vision of the future.

Now it must, of course, be left to the physicists to deal with the physi implications and consequences of this theory. That new knowledge in rega to radium, and new views as to the ultimate constitution of matter, have n left the problem where it was, is the common belief of most educat people. Whether these or other new data suffice to give probability Mr. Mozley's supposition is, however, a further question. For our prese purpose it must be noted as an important feature of the book, that the wri is optimistic enough to look for the satisfaction of human aspirations with the limits of this present world. Believing in personal immortality a another state of being, it is still with this world, not with any new heaven earth, that he is concerned. No stress is laid upon the prospect of a l elsewhere. The main contention of the book could probably be accepted one who had been unable to retain the belief in personal survival after dea From one point of view this involves a new orientation. From another is, perhaps, a modern equivalent of the belief in a Kingdom of God th should arrive one day in this present world. "The theory of evolutio said Huxley in his Romanes lecture, "encourages no millennial anticipation But that, no doubt, was four and twenty years ago.

In one important feature the book does, as it seems to us, lie open criticism. As a whole it is not sufficiently under the control of its autho central purpose. The ultimate intention is not so dominant and penetrat as it might have been. We imagine the writer to have devoted to his w many years of laborious study, gathering his material now in China, now in Palestine, now among the German sceptics. Certainly he gathe abundantly. There remained the process of bringing this collected st into form and proportion. One day this had gone so far that a friend t

n that his book had "ceased to be amorphous." His friend was right. one would call the book amorphous. But the process might have been ried further. Closer relation, stricter coherence, more knitting of the mbers into a body, the impress on every chapter of a main purpose to ich all the elements must subserve, would have greatly increased the ue of Mr. Mozley's undertaking. The particulars of history become ietimes so interesting, alike it may be to the reader and his guide, that forget it is "the divine aspect" of which we are in quest. Hence, if we y be allowed the term, the book at times is polyoptic rather than optic in character. We have the many elements, we want the link. mparison naturally suggests itself with Hegel's *Lectures on the Philosophy History*. In that work the philosopher is so much more in evidence than historian that the reader is conscious of the opposite tendency. The ts are compelled to fit the scheme. The principle dominates; the items e their place. His readers will not quarrel with Mr. Mozley for not ng a Hegelian, but it is possible that they will wish he had at least sessed a larger measure of the continental thinker's gift of synthesis.

The book, it is evident, has been the work of a life-time. And Mr. zley has not spent his years in vain. He has made a wide survey, and nas not been his purpose to discover new data or to investigate the explored. He has shewn that it is possible, in these uncertain times, and er many years of quest, to surrender not a few of the traditional aids to viction, and yet after a candid and a dispassionate consideration of the rse of human history to retain faith in the purpose and the reality of God, he career of this minor planet upon which our lot is cast, and even in the ure of the human race. In sombre days, while the whole fabric of lisation seems to shake amid the reverberation of the guns of war, our in feeling towards such a writer must be one of grateful thanks.

R. B. Tollinton.

THE BISHOP THAT DID.*

Mr. H. G. Wells has written another book of no little interest to Liberal gymen. His *Soul of a Bishop* tells how a bishop after certain divine ons (the thinnest part of the book) resolves to resign his see. The visions e immediately produced by taking a drug, but they had been preceded by eological controversy with a Liberal clergyman, and by the bishop's overy that he himself was perfectly powerless to intervene effectively in constant disputes between workmen and their employers in the industria res of his diocese. The bishop, however, is a sportsman: he steadily s the situation in very much the heroic fashion in which the antiquated nish fleet at Manilla faced the up-to-date American navy, but he is dly becoming a nervous wreck, and is induced in consequence to take a . He then has a vision of God (ironically related to have taken place ie Athenaeum Club), and on the repetition of the vision resigns his see.

* *The Soul of a Bishop*. Pub. Cassell & Co., London (1917).

To resign his see involves great personal sacrifices, but he bravely ma them. But we cannot help feeling that Mr. Wells makes out from modern point of view a very poor case for the bishop's resignation. To back at the critical moment on the *deus ex machina* is a discredited dev and hardly worthy of a psychologist of Mr. Wells' quality. It is true Mr. Wells reproduces and even parodies the Liberal or Modernist argum against the resignation of Liberals, but he does not answer them. He se to confess that they cannot be answered argumentatively. He writes of hero after his discussion with the Liberal bishop Likeman:—

"He had a strong persuasion that Likeman was wrong— unanswerable" (p. 146).

Certainly Likeman's statement of the case given at some length a pages later on seems to us to be quite sound.

"I quite understand, and I sympathise with your impatience the Church at the present time; we present a spectacle of pomp insignificance hard to bear with. We are doing very little, and we giving ourselves preposterous airs. There seems to be an opi abroad that in some quasi-automatic way the country is going to coll after the war into the arms of the Church and the High Torie possibility I don't accept for a moment. Why should it? T forcible-feeble reactionaries are much more likely to explode a revolt that will disestablish us. And I quite understand your theolo difficulties—quite. The creeds, if their entire symbolism is f moment forgotten, if they are taken as opaque statements of fact inconsistent, *incredible*. So incredible that no one believes them; even the most devout. . . .

"Let the reform come from within the Church. The Churc something more than either its creeds, its clergy, or its laymen. I at your cathedral rising out of and dominating Princhester. It st not simply for Athanasius, it stands but incidentally for Athanasiu stands for all religion. Within that fabric—let me be as frank he in our private conversation—doctrine has altered again and again. day two distinct religions worship there side by side; one that fade one that grows brighter. There is the old quasi-materialistic beli the barbarians, the belief in such things, for example, as that Chris physical Son of God descended into hell and stayed there, seein sights I suppose like any tourist, and being treated with diplo civilities for three terrestrial days; and on the other hand there i truly spiritual belief that you and I share, which is absolutely intol of such grotesque ideas. My argument to you is that the new faith clearer vision, gains ground; that the only thing that can preve delay the Church from being altogether possessed by what you cal I admit is, the true God, is that such men as yourself, as the breaks upon you, should be hasty and leave the Church.

"You see my point of view, do you not? It is not one th been assumed for our discussion; it is one I came to long years . . . A word for your private ear. I am working. I cannot te

fully because I am not working alone. But there are movements afoot in which I hope very shortly to be able to ask you to share. This much at least I may say at this stage. Obscure but very powerful influences are at work for the liberalising of the Church, for release from many narrow limitations, for the establishment of a *modus vivendi* with the Nonconformist and dissentient bodies in Britain and America, and with the Churches of the East. But of that no more now" (pp. 160-162).

We venture to think also that the reasons given by the bishop for hesitating to resign his See would strike the average educated layman as worthy of respect.

"I feel like a son, growing up, who finds his mother isn't quite so clear-spoken nor quite so energetic as she seemed to be once. She's *right*, I feel sure. I've never doubted her fundamental goodness. . . .

"And yet there's this futility . . . You know, my dear lady, I don't know what to do. One feels on the one hand, that here is a cloud of witnesses, great men, sainted men, subtle men, figures permanently historical, before whom one can do nothing but bow down in the utmost humility, here is a great instrument and organisation—what would the world be without the witness of the Church? and on the other hand here are our masses out of hand and hostile, our industrial leaders equally hostile; there is a failure to grip, and that failure to grip is so clearly traceable to the fact that our ideas are not modern ideas, that when we come to profess our faith we find nothing in our mouths but antiquated Alexandrian subtleties and phrases and ideas that may have been quite alive, quite significant, quite adequate in Asia Minor or Egypt, among men essentially Orientals, fifteen hundred years ago, but which now—

"Probably I'm not alone among my brethren," he went on, and then: "But what is one to do? . . .

"One may be precipitate, . . . there's a kind of loyalty and discipline that requires one to keep the ranks until one's course of action is perfectly clear. . . . One owes so much to so many. One has to consider how one may affect—oh! people one has never seen.

"If there was something else, an alternative, another religion, another Church, to which one could go, the whole case would be different. But to go from the Church to nothingness isn't to go from falsehood to truth. It's to go from truth, rather badly expressed, rather conservatively hidden by its protections, truth in an antiquated costume to the blackest lie—in the world." (pp. 93-95).

The reason why Mr. Wells and Liberal Churchmen are hardly likely to agree as to the rightness of the bishop's action, is that Mr. Wells is an individualist in religion, and cannot see any use in the Christian Church or the Christian Ministry. Of course, if like Mr. Wells, a bishop should come to disbelieve in the value of the Church and Ministry, it would be absurd and wrong for him to remain a bishop; but if a bishop however dissatisfied he may feel with the present condition of the Church and Ministry, yet believes that they are able to perform great services to mankind, then his

business is to continue to serve in them, and while serving to strive to reform them. To resign is merely a dereliction of duty.

On the other hand to be a Liberal clergyman, and not confess one's Liberalism; or to be a Liberal and feebly abstain from doing anything for the cause of Liberalism, and meanwhile to enjoy the emoluments of a Church which one knows is not fulfilling its functions, and which one is not trying to fit to fulfil them, is contemptible.

Yet Mr. Wells does make a point with which we agree entirely that the Church ought not to go on using traditional symbolical formulas of a complicated character in her public worship. She ought at least to supply her members with simple, modern, alternative forms.

> "Likeman had puzzled and silenced him, only upon reflection to convince him that amidst such intricacies of explanation the spirit cannot live. Creeds may be symbolical, but symbols must not prevaricate. A Church that can symbolise everything and anything means nothing" (p. 152).

Mr. Wells seems to shew us in this, his latest volume, exactly how a Liberal clergyman ought not to act. The book might be described as the story of a bishop who managed to save his own soul but failed to save his Church.

In the past, certain Liberals have gone out from the Church and joined various sects or founded new ones, but Mr. Wells' bishop goes out and does nothing. Meanwhile, the obscurantists and fanatics, the worldlings and hypocrites, continue to represent and misrepresent the Religion of Christ and present the world with caricatures and parodies of it, which are regarded by the world as authoritative because of the official position of the teachers. This may seem a satisfactory solution of the difficulty to Mr. Wells, but it does not commend itself to Liberal clergymen.

Mr. Wells' advice, it must be allowed, harmonises with the modern English temperament, which disposes men to withdraw from difficult and doubtful situations instead of urging them to remain and do their duty. Resignation, although a personal relief, is no remedy for the present situation.

H.D.A.M.

WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY.*

A critical study of the history of early Christianity such as Mr. Allworthy has produced in his book *Women in the Apostolic Church*, furnishes a strong case for the spiritual equality of men and women. Christianity swept aside the barriers between races; it abolished the spiritual supremacy of man. In Christ there is no distinction of Jew or Greek, bond and free, male and female. Those distinctions are recognised by the world but not by the

---

* *Women in the Apostolic Church*, by T. B. Allworthy. Heffer & Sons, 3/- net. (1917).
Woman and the Church, by B. H. Streeter and Edith Picton-Turberville. T. Fisher Unwin, 3/6 net. (1917).

Church. Men and women being spiritually equal it would seem to follow that women ought to enjoy all the essentially spiritual priviliges of men in a spiritual society such as the Christian Church. Hence we find that both men and women shared equally in the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, and were equally present at all gatherings of the Apostolic Church for worship. Of the legislative assemblies of the Church in these times we know little, but at the Council of Jerusalem there is no indication that women were present. To Jews the presence and participation of women in such an assembly would be offensive. Yet Mr. Allworthy thinks that women voted among the 120 who elected Matthias. In the Acts we find that women were admitted to the Christian ministry when the distinction between layman and cleric hardly existed. Prisca or Priscilla was evidently an able and ardent missionary, and taught men, even the mighty Apollos. The daughters of Philip the Evangelist prophesied in Christian assemblies. St. Paul seems to have described Junias or Junia (Rom. xvi.) as an apostle, *i.e.*, a missionary. Phoebe, he speaks of as a deaconess or servant or minister of the Church of Cenchreae. Mary the mother of John, Mark, and Lydia, were "patronesses" of the infant churches in their respective localities. Why then did St. Paul forbid women to preach and to exercise authority? It was a prudent concession to local conditions, and no doubt was partly due to his Rabbinical training, but it is no more to be regarded as a Christian rule for all time than the prohibition promulgated by the Council of Jerusalem forbidding Gentile Christians to eat meat which is not *kosher*.

"In those early days," to quote Mr. Allworthy, "to be a Christian at all was to be a 'minister,' and women according to their powers co-operated with men in the manifold activities of the local communities, in which as in the Church at large there was no room for rivalries and distinctions."

"You see," says St. Chrysostom, referring to Phoebe and Prisca, "these were noble women, hindered in no way by their sex in the course of virtue, and this as might be expected, for in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female."

Mr. Allworthy's conclusion that our Lord's attitude towards women was "revolutionary" should be carefully noted as also the fact that we know most about that attitude from St. Luke. Although our Lord had numerous women disciples we must not forget that He chose no woman to be of the Twelve. No doubt this restriction was required by Jewish custom, yet this fact may be rightly urged as a reason for not putting principles into immediate and complete action where by so doing the influence of the Church would be seriously affected.

Canon Streeter and Miss Picton Turbervill's book, *Woman and the Church*, is not intended to claim either the priesthood or the episcopate for women, but to urge the wider employment of women in preaching and pastoral work. They feel that

> "the prohibition of women as such from taking any official part in the delivery of the Christian message in a consecrated building, as a slight and insult to the sex." (p. 10).

With this we agree. It is urged that, in interpreting St. Paul, it is the spirit and not the letter which counts, and that his spirit was the spirit of liberty. They believe that right solutions of pressing difficulties in connection with marriage, parentage, and divorce, would be assisted by giving women an official position in the Church. They indicate that there is a serious drift of women from the Church at the present time, and that it will probably reach large dimensions, for women are both more conservative and more revolutionary than men; they point out also that the new women have chosen, not men, but women as leaders; the conclusion they have come to, and it deserves the serious attention of our Church authorities, is that a Church which ignores, if it does not insult the claims of women, is not likely to be a Church which will retain the women of the future. Yet fear of the old women in male attire who dominate our ecclesiastical assemblies, may easily delay concessions to women, which, if they are to be made effectively, ought to be made as soon as possible. The Church of England has, of recent years, taken such a number of wrong turnings at critical moments owing to timid conservatism and terror of traditionalists, that, although in this matter of women and the ministry we desire much, yet we dare hardly anticipate that women will receive immediately that position in the ministry of the Church of England which was theirs in the ministry of the Primitive Church. Still the growth of public opinion would make it easier to grant concessions here than in many other important matters.

A characteristic Foreword is contributed to this volume by the Bishop of Durham. He writes:—

> "I attempt no forecast, nor do I even touch the great problem here with my own hand. I only say that, while loyal submission to the Holy Scriptures as our Master's Word is guarded, we are always called to be ready to find 'new light break forth from them.' . . ." (p. vi.).

Is this the leadership Churchmen ought to receive in this matter from a bishop who fills a great historic See, and has the reputation of being both a scholar and teacher? May we commend another ideal to Churchmen than that of "loyal submission to the Holy Scriptures as our Master's Word," and that is readiness to be led by the Spirit of Christ. The Church will never have the courage and strength to face our modern problems and to solve them until she recognises, as the author of *Ecce Homo* wrote, that:—

> "The New Testament is not the Christian Law. Apostolic precepts are not the Christian Law. The Spirit of Christ is the Christian Law."

H.D.A.M.

THE THINGS THAT ARE CAESAR'S.*

The appeal unto Caesar is the appeal to justice; it is the appeal to "the spaciousness, the detachment, the equity of Roman law," in contrast to "the rancour of the priesthood and the turbulence of the populace."

Such is the theme of this brilliant shillingsworth of wit and wisdom. Large and small churches alike "have too easily become centres of fanaticism

* *The Things that are Caesar's*, by Alfred Fawkes. Pub. John Murray, price 1/-.

and intolerance, or at best, like the Quakers, formed a shelter for a spiritual *élite*." Mr. Fawkes' quotation from the eighth book of Hooker (the reference, by the way, should be i. 2, not i. 1), will be exceedingly distasteful to the Disestablishment party of to-day.

> "There is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth, which is not also of the Church of England."

But, as Mr. Fawkes says:—

> "Christianity is an integral part of Western civilization, and there is no man who has inherited this civilization who has not also inherited membership of the Christian community or Church" (p. 8).

With a passing sweep of his sword our author cuts down those who would abolish Deans, three of them in particular, and rides against the champions of ignorance and of "a dull illiterate parochialism," transfixing "the Great Slum Fallacy" on his way. All this is very wholesome reading for those who want "little Latin and less Greek" in their ministers, but probably it will pass over their heads and leave them untouched. It recently fell to the reviewer to discuss some of these questions with a rural branch of the C.E.M.S. There was much talk of patronage and pew rents, establishments and endowments, but not one speaker had any inkling of "the silent desertion of intelligent men, who go away for lack of instruction which they can understand or accept."[1] *O fortunatos nimium agricolas!*

Extremes meet; the peaceful bucolic mind sees no need for sound learning; "insolent and aggressive factions" actively dislike it.

Bishops, says *The Challenge*, "are either the organ of the Holy Spirit, or they are nothing." But, as Mr. Fawkes well says:—

> "We need be under little apprehension that the Church press would accept the pronouncements of the Episcopate as those of the Holy Spirit unless those pronouncements were in its own sense" (p. 17).

Whether it is true of Parliament that "with all its faults, its instinct for righteousness is stronger than that of any lesser assembly, civil or religious, to be found among us" is more open to question. But righteousness means justice, and does not necessarily connote all the Christian virtues. It is a safeguard against that liberty which means "liberty for the irrational element in the Church to ride roughshod over the rational"—a judgment which is supported by Mr. Fawkes' quotation from that treasury of wisdom, Bishop Thirlwall's *Charges*:—

> "I believe that the kind of liberty which they desire would be a grinding tyranny, and the worst calamity that could befall the Church."

If this is the price of Disestablishment, Liberal Churchmen had better take to heart the grave words of the most learned Bishop of the nineteenth century.

The following passage is one to read carefully and remember:—

[1] Kirsopp Lake, *Stewardship of Faith*, p. 129.

The laity simply do not care; and silence is taken for consent to change—or the reverse, as the case may be. "The pew is becoming emptier and emptier." Nevertheless, many Churches are still well-filled, and many of the laity do care deeply, but are powerless or inarticulate. The problem is how to give them the voice and power that they need. A "self-governing Church" sounds obviously right on paper, but there is no more reason for thinking that a Synod will elect better bishops than a Prime Minister nominates, than there is for thinking that their quality will be improved by increasing their quantity and paying them less. The "Life and Liberty" movement is not destitute of wise leaders; the danger is that its leaders, for the sake of peace and getting something done, will put their trust in majorities, and commit themselves to reforms of which they do not personally approve. The Holy Spirit, Who, in the Middle Ages, was regarded as the God of the intellect rather than of the heart, does not usually fight on the side of the big battalions.

Mr. Fawkes concludes by reminding us that the Church has much to learn from Bishop Butler and the 18th century theologians. They were religious, and they were also rational. But there were strong men after Agamemnon as well as before him. Mr. Fawkes has quoted Bishop Thirlwall. I would add the name of Archbishop Whateley, a thinker too little read now. And in our own times Hort has preserved the true tradition:—

> "And the great value of the connection with the State, which is so distinctive a note of the Church of England, is neither the status which it confers, nor the endowments whose possession it safeguards—though the wise man will despise neither—but the restraint which it imposes on the fanaticism of partisans, on the intolerance of priesthoods, and the tyranny of synods, in which, by what seems a law of their being, the least rational elements preponderate and the most violent counsels prevail. Who can doubt that, in the event of Disestablishment in this country, the ministry would be closed to men of independent mind? that terms of communion would be imposed which would alienate non-party Churchmen? and that the moral and intellectual standing of what was once the Church of England would be lowered from the level of a Church to that of a sect?" (p. 23).

Mr. Fawkes insists repeatedly on the apathy and indifference of the laity, and his words have received striking confirmation in a recent article in the *Guardian* by a senior chaplain in France:—

> "'The longer I am out here, the more I care for Christianity and the less I care for the Church of England.' So spake the padre. And his theological connection? A Latitudinarian? A Low Churchman? A fervent but un-Catholic Evangelical? No; just a priest-member of one of our Church of England religious Communities. And in so far as the phrase shocks the reader, to that extent can the reader rest assured of his own alienation from the real laity. The layman is an incorrigible person. He simply will not become interested in 'Church questions,' and thereby he saves Christianity."

"There can be no surer sign of decreptitude and decay in faith than a prevalent nervousness about naming and commending reason." (*Hulseans*, p. 176).

The worst of it is that the appeal to reason often fails because the majority of mankind are not reasonable. And this applies especially to the sacerdotal mind. But when Reason is divorced from Religion, faith becomes superstition, and the path of the wayfaring man is strewn with "loose stones."

T.F.R.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

Hertfordshire Branch.—At the invitation of one of our lay members, Mr. H. J. Walker, of St. Albans, a meeting of the Hertfordshire Branch (founded in 1916) was held at his house to consider how best to carry on the Branch. It was arranged that during 1918 three meetings should be held, if possible at different centres. For the first of these (in St. Albans about the end of January) the subject proposed for discussion was "The Gospel of a Modern Churchman."

Bristol Branch.—The second of the winter session lectures was given on November 4th, in the Council Room of the West of England Academy, when a good number of members and others attended to hear the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers, on "Modernism: Roman and Anglican." Mr. Fawkes' ability as a brilliant essayist is well known to readers of the *Modern Churchmen* and other periodicals, and also to those who have attended the various Conferences of the Churchmen's Union. His historical survey of the Modernist Movement was consequently listened to with close close attention. Time only permitted of a short discussion, in which the Rev. J. Gamble, who presided, took part.

The Change of Name.—There were 426 votes cast in connection with the proposal to change the name of the Society from Churchmen's Union to Modern Churchmen's Union. Of the votes 248 were for the change, and 178 against. As a two-thirds *majority* was required to carry the change of name the proposal has not been carried. To judge by the votes cast the great bulk of our members had no desire for change, or else mislaid their voting papers.

Manuals' Fund.—Subscriptions received since the last acknowledgment:—F. N. Scott (Watford), £1; Rev. J. E. Kelsall (New Milton), 14/-; G. H. Glendinning (Newcastle-on-Tyne), £1 1s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

OUR ATTITUDE TO THE LIFE AND LIBERTY MOVEMENT.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Is not the position of the Life and Liberty Movement in remarkable agreement with our own? It is out for adjustment to modern conditions, spiritually, mentally, socially, ecclesiastically. Its programme is such that extreme ecclesiasticism is more likely to oppose than support it, several concrete items are identical with our own, and, above all, it believes with us in the corporate guidance of the Holy Spirit as a living and present reality. Surely consistency with our own principles should bid us to hail the Movement with enthusiasm? Yet (though I may be mistaken) the *Modern Churchman* seems to be hanging back. One can guess the reason—fear lest Disestablishment should result and, in consequence, a possible combined assault, by obscurantists High and Low, upon the Liberal school in the Church.

Those older and more experienced than I am may feel the possibility and danger to be more real than I can do myself, but even so, one wonders if it is really relevant to the question. Surely faith in God, not ecclesiastical expediency, should rule our counsels? If we really believe in the Holy Spirit's guidance, we shall consider the matter solely on its merits, and act accordingly. Courageous trust in God will bring its own safety and reward, and a great opportunity be grasped, to His glory.

H.T.M.

[We have held back because we were not sure which road the Life and Liberty Movement was going to take. Its leading supporters seemed to represent two types, in one of which we should feel confidence, but not in the other. Now that the movement has come down, as we think, on the Liberal side of the fence in the important matter of the franchise, we feel more secure as to its future operations, although the fact that it has eliminated Miss Maude Royden is somewhat disconcerting.

Moreover, we must confess from some considerable experience of Colonial Churches that Disestablishment does not mean either life or liberty. The established Church in England is certainly more comprehensive, and is just as free and vital as any of her non-established daughter Churches.

We should not hesitate to surrender both establishment and endowments for undoubted moral and spiritual benefits, but we wish to be certain that we shall secure them by such a surrender. Moreover, it does not appear to us that it is an alteration in the relation of the Church to Parliament which is going to secure us those educational, liturgical, and other reforms so greatly desired by Liberal Churchmen, but a change in the mind and heart of the English clergy. In so far as the Life and Liberty Movement is going to work for this, we gladly extend to it the right hand of fellowship.—Ed. *M.C.*]

THREE SERVICES REVISED.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I should like to thank you for the most thoughtful and excellent revision of these Services, and for reprinting them in so handy a form. I hope you will allow some discussion of them, and further suggestions to be made; for it is only through such frank comparison of thoughts that the best will evolve.

1. Would it not be well for the Baptismal Service to begin with some such statement as the following:—

> Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are made and created in the image of God, and seeing that He hath bestowed on this infant the glorious gift of life to be used for His honour and praise and love, let us now dedicate this life to His service and keeping, even as Christ commanded His disciples saying, Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.
>
> Hear, moreover, the words of the Gospel [St. Mark x. 13] . . .

2. I think that it would be better if a special collect were provided for the Celebration in the Marriage Service. The Quinquagesima one is very beautiful; but something is wanted which is more directly apposite to the ceremony. I believe that a good collect might be framed from the Sarum prayers already translated in our rite.

3. It is well indeed to have got rid of the gloomy paganism (so contradictory to the spirit of the General Thanksgiving) that disfigures the Burial Service; but I still deprecate the suggestion to read any part of 1 Corinthians xv. as the Lesson. Its statements are liable to be so grievously misunderstood that it is probably one of the least suitable passages of the New Testament to be read by mourners. I should prefer 1 Thessalonians iv. 13-18,—a passage full of symbolism, no doubt, but not symbolism that lends itself to such perversion as the argument in 1 Corinthians. The passages from 2 Corinthians and from the Revelation are excellent.

Denton, Norfolk, T. HERBERT BINDLEY.
24th November, 1917.

[We welcome Archdeacon Bindley's valuable suggestions.

1. We approve of a preliminary statement, and feel that the one offered presents no difficulty save in the declaration that Christ commanded Baptism in the Name of the Trinity. The critical and historical arguments against this appear to be so strong as to provide a good reason for not including it in a preliminary statement. The modern Churchman, if he wishes to refer to words of Christ as giving authority for Infant Baptism, will prefer to cite: "Suffer little children to come unto Me."
2. We agree with this proposal. It has also come to us from other sources. We should be glad to publish any suitable collects.
3. We recognise the danger, but think that if 1 Cor. xv. be retained only as an alternative, the danger is greatly mimimized.—ED. *M.C.*]

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

May a layman make a remark? In your November number, page 440, reference is made under the heading "Three Services Revised" to your number for June last. On referring to this, page 131, I find a short address to somebody or something at the end of a service for the Burial of the Dead, beginning "Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit you." Nobody I suppose would wish to cavil if it comforts anyone's feelings to pray for a dead friend or relative in private, but to whom are these words addressed? To the Deity Himself? To an inanimate corpse whose immortal soul has already gone before the only Righteous Judge? Or to the assembled congregation? This should surely be made clear.

Many people who still follow the teaching of the Reformed Church have a strong objection to anything which suggests the doctrine of Purgatory, and why should their feelings be needlessly offended? Others who believe in Purgatory would no doubt prefer a more direct prayer for the soul of the departed, and if this is intended why not make it so?

An address to a corpse is useless, and one to the congregation should run "ourselves, or us," and not "you," but why change the dismissal which appears in the Book of Common Prayer; it is surely comprehensive enough as it includes "us all," and has the advantage of being biblical.

I have noticed at several funerals which I have attended in various places during the last few years that the Prayer-book service was thus departed from, also that the clergyman usually wore a curious kind of hat in Church called a "biretta," the two seemed to be concomitant; also that the words seemed to be spoken to the corpse. May I suggest that whether this custom is to be followed or not, that anyhow the Prayer-book benediction to the mourners be used at the and of the service?

HARRY SCARLETT.

Prestone, Firle, Sussex,
November 25th, 1917.

[The words are addressed to the mourners. They may be found in the Prayer-book in the Visitation of the Sick, where they form the concluding blessing. I have slightly abbreviated them, and have changed "thee" into "you," as the case requires. This particular form of Blessing was composed in 1549, and breathes the spirit and is reminiscent of the phraseology of scripture, although not a direct quotation from scripture as is "the Grace." A change from a very familiar form of words has, providing the new words be appropriate, this advantage that it arrests the attention of the auditors. However our correspondent has furnished a good reason for retaining the old form of dismissal.

The reviser does affect the use of the *biretta* as a *decus et tutamen*. Prayers for the Dead, especially when combined with prayers for the living, need not, and do not, suggest Purgatory to modern minded-people. Such prayers are the outcome of a natural, and we may believe, not un-Christian, emotion.—ED. *M.C.*]

*** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.